Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

July 16, 2015, 8:30 am to 11:00 am
Coppin State University, Talon Center, Room 210

Meeting Minutes

Purpose of Meeting:
To discuss historic properties identified within the B&P Tunnel Project Section 106 area of potential effects (APE) and to have preliminary discussions on project impacts to historic properties. The meeting began 8:30 am and ended 11:45 am.

Attendees:

• Maryland Historical Trust	Beth Cole, Tim Tamburrino
• Baltimore Heritage	Johns Hopkins
• Baltimore National Heritage Area	Jason Vaughan
• Preservation Maryland	Margaret De Arcangelis
• Baltimore City Department of Planning	Kyle Leggs
• Baltimore City Commission for Historical and Architectural Preservation	Lauren Schiszik
• Mount Royal Improvement Association	Steve Howard
• Amtrak	William Prosser
• Federal Railroad Administration	Laura Schick, Bradley Decker
• Maryland Department of Transportation	Jacqueline Thorne
• Maryland Transit Administration	Jean Wolfers-Lawrence
• RK&K	Ken Goon, Eric Almquist, Christeen Taniguchi, Ryan Snyder
• Rosborough Communications, Inc.	Tori Leonard

The following summarizes major topics discussed during the meeting:

Introduction

- Meeting attendees were welcomed and asked to introduce themselves.
- The consulting parties were asked whether they had prior experience with the Section 106 process.
- An overview of the project and study area was provided. The B&P Tunnel is 1.4 miles in length and includes three separate tunnel segments, located along Amtrak's Northeast Corridor between Baltimore Penn Station and the West Baltimore MARC Station.
- *Question:* Mr. Hopkins of Baltimore Heritage asked if the problem with the existing tunnel is the size and curviness, rather than its structure/materials? Answer: The tunnel is currently safe but nearing the end of its useful life. The structure and materials require increasing amounts of maintenance as the tunnel ages.
- *Question*: Mr. Howard of the Mount Royal Improvement Association asked, if a new tunnel is built, what will happen to the old one? Answer: Disposition of the existing tunnel would be

included in consideration of any new tunnel build alternative. Specifics of the disposition are not yet determined.

- Information was provided on project funding, status, and schedule.

Alternatives Overview

- Sixteen preliminary alternatives were evaluated and screened by the project team, with public input, based on the ability to feasibly meet the project's Purpose and Need and objectives set by Amtrak, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT).
- Four alternatives were carried forward for further evaluation: Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 11.
    - Alternative 1, No Build – This alternative would not rebuild or replace the tunnel, but continue use of the existing B&P Tunnel with no improvements aside from routine maintenance.
    - Alternative 2 – This alternative would reconstruct and modernize the tunnel in its existing alignment including widening. Cut-and-cover construction required would impact streets above the tunnel and adjacent homes and businesses. This alternative involves a two-track tunnel and thus doesn't meet the project's Purpose and Need. This alternative would require shutting down the Northeast Corridor during construction. The team does not feel this alternative is viable.
- *Question: Mr. Howard asked, does this study address freight capacity*? Answer: Norfolk Southern has access rights, but the study is concerned primarily with passenger service. The Alternatives would accommodate future double-stack freight clearance, but the project's purpose is not to increase freight service.
- *Question: Mr. Howard noted, the Howard Street tunnel does not accommodate double-stack freight; do you intend to put Howard Street traffic into this tunnel?* Answer: That is not the intent of the study, as CSX does not currently operate on Amtrak's Northeast Corridor through Baltimore. But the project does not preclude accommodating double-stack freight trains in order to allow flexibility in the future. Other improvements would need to occur outside the scope of this project in order for CSX freight traffic to be routed through the proposed tunnels.
- Alternatives 3 and 11 share common elements including bored tunnel construction, four tracks located in four bores, and they would each require ventilation plants to ensure proper tunnel ventilation, emergency containment, and evacuation needs.
    - Alternatives 3 and 11 include considerations for the future of the existing tunnel.
    - Each would require three above-grade ventilation plants to house fans and control systems. One would be located at the north portal, one mid-tunnel, and one at the south portal. The vent plant footprint is estimated, conservatively, at 100 feet by 200 feet, with a height of 55 feet. The estimated footprint can be modified to an extent. The plants would also include sound attenuators to reduce the noise of the fans, and facilities to allow for emergency egress/access.
        - *Question: Do you know what the vent plants will look like and where they will be placed?* Answer: Yes, concepts and approximate locations will be shown later in the meeting.

- Attendees were provided mapping of the APE for Alternatives 3 and 11 including surface disturbance areas, individual historic properties, historic districts, track alignments, and vent plant locations. The APE contains potential direct and indirect effect areas including noise, visual, and atmospheric.
- *Question: Is the majority of the APE due to the vent plants?* Answer: Vent plants are one reason, but also the portal excavation and cut-and-cover areas.
    - Mr. Goon of RK&K offered additional background on the maps; the rectangles note the general vent plant locations but there is flexibility about where they are ultimately placed.
- *Question: Would the electric substation at Madison and Eutaw be comparable?* Answer: Similar architecture would be considered.
- *Question: Mr. Hopkins asked, have you done vibration analysis?* Answer: There has been a cursory level of analysis but it is difficult to say whether a specific property will incur vibration impacts. Other factors to consider include home construction, soil, etc., but all will eventually be evaluated. It is reasonable to expect less impact at 150' below the surface, but the project will conduct a detailed analysis after the alignment is chosen.
- *Question: Have you looked at this issue (vibration) in other areas around the country?* Answer: Yes, in New York and elsewhere, other systems deep below the ground (around 150') are in solid rock resulting in less chance of noticeable vibration.
- *Question: Mr. Howard asked, if you do a detailed vibration study only after you have chosen an alignment, is it then too late to change at that point and you are really looking at mitigation?* Answer: Yes, because we expect comparable impacts under any alignment, but the detailed analysis would identify particularly sensitive sites (e.g. the Metro's consideration of the Wilmer Eye Clinic at Johns Hopkins). The project can mitigate for vibration with engineering and design solutions. Mr. Almquist of RK&K added there would be vibration impacts from the boring machines, but that severe impacts would be unlikely.
- *Question: Is there a long-term, cumulative impact from the train operation?* Answer: Impacts from a new, deeper tunnel would likely be lesser than vibration from the existing B&P Tunnel. Mr. Goon added that the existing track level is 40 feet below the surface, not 150 feet deep.
- *Question: Ms. Cole of the Maryland Historical Trust asked, can you give a sense of the degree of flexibility of the current alignments?* Answer: The project does have constraints with the Northeast Corridor connections and the need to maintain service to Penn Station and the West Baltimore MARC Station. Rail has less flexibility than highway when it comes to track geometry; small changes to portal and track locations can require shifting a substantial length of the alignment.
- *Question: Ms. Cole asked, the width of the corridor is set by four bores – is that easier to construct?* Answer: Yes, it is easier due to smaller bores, placement of ventilation shafts, and emergency egress considerations.
- *Question: What is the tunnel width?* Answer: Mr. Goon explained the tunnel diameters equaled 32.5 feet, plus 20 feet between bores. He noted that the limits of disturbance would have to allow room for constructability.

- *Question: Is the Baltimore Harbor Tunnel comparable?* Answer: Mr. Goon explained that the tunnel bores are sized for trains but include walkways and emergency access. Mr. Almquist added the track width narrows at the portals; it is wider underground due to the bore separation. Mr. Goon emphasized the critical input needed is choice between the alternatives and not to refine or shift the alignments.
- Alternatives 3A, 3B, and 3C
    - Alignment, portal, and potential vent plant location overviews were provided for Alternatives 3A, 3B, and 3C.
- Alternatives 11A and 11B
    - Alignment, portal, and potential vent plant location overviews were provided for Alternatives 11A and 11B.

Section 106 and Your Role as Consulting Parties

- Attendees were given an overview of the Section 106 Process and the role of consulting parties
    - Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act is a Federal law requiring lead Federal agencies, such as FRA, to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties.
    - This meeting is part of the important process of seeking, discussing, and considering the views of consulting parties about how project effects on historic properties should be handled.
- The consulting parties' role is advisory; the project team will respond in detail to comments provided. FRA will ultimately lead project decisions.
- *Question: Is there a website or email for comments after this meeting*? Answer: Yes, [www.bptunnel.com or info@bptunnel.com] but also please contact Eric Almquist [ealmquist@rkk.com] or Christeen Taniguchi [ctaniguchi@rkk.com].
- *Question: Does the 106 process start today?* Answer: The process began about a year ago, when the project team initiated collaboration with the Maryland Historical Trust. Today is the beginning of the consultation, a key part of the process.
- The project team has identified historic properties through research and field work, and additional properties that may need further individual evaluation. The project will assess adverse effects and resolution. There is an Advisory Council on Historic Preservation publication, *A Citizen's Guide to Section 106 Guide Review*, which would be useful for consulting parties new to the Section 106 process.

Area of Potential Effects and Study Area

- A map was provided showing the APE for Alternatives 3 and 11 and the historic properties identified in and around the APE. Build Alternative 2 received a study area boundary because it will likely not be carried forward.

Historic Properties within the Area of Potential Effects

Ms. Taniguchi of RK&K gave an overview of the 19 historic properties identified within the project APE, which include districts, buildings, and structures, that are either listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The four criteria for NRHP evaluation are: A-That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; B-That are associated with the lives of significant persons in or past; C-That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; and D-That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory. The properties must also retain integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Mr. Almquist noted the historic properties are all included on the handouts given to the attendees. The information was obtained from existing records and databases at the Maryland Historical Trust. The project has also identified additional properties for NRHP evaluation.

Potential Impacts to Historic Properties

- There are no physical impacts to the Howard Street and North Avenue bridges.
- *Question: Are the impacts physical and not visual?* Answer: The project team began by first identifying the properties that would be physically impacted by construction of the south portal. We expect minimal or no impacts to properties above the bored portions of the tunnel, and each alternative (except for Alternative 2) would have similar and relatively minor impacts at the north portal. Physical impacts would occur from the vent plants, but the directly impacted historic properties (if any) are not yet known. Visual impacts from the portal areas and vent plants will be assessed at a later stage.
- *Question: Is Harlem Park a separately designated district?* Answer: Yes, it was determined eligible for the NRHP. Districts at the south portal area overlap and the team is considering how to best treat them and would welcome comments from the group on this. Ms. Taniguchi explained that the dotted areas on the maps provided represent areas outside the current mapping of the proposed Midtown Edmondson Historic District NRHP nomination, but could be included as part of an industrial context for the purposes of this project. The project team needs input on whether these areas need evaluation. Mr. Hopkins asked that the team include the Acme Warehouse/American Grocery property on the list for evaluation. Mr. Tamburrino of the Maryland Historical Trust committed to revisiting.
- *Question: Ms. Schiszik of the Baltimore City Commission for Historical and Architectural Preservation asked if there is a potential for archeological finds?* Answer: Yes, although large portions of the study corridors have been disturbed, the potential for both pre- and post-contact archeological sites still exist. There is a higher potential for post-contact sites. We intend to suspend detailed archeological impact studies until selection of a Preferred Alternative.
- Mr. Almquist discussed buildings and structures within existing historic districts that may require individual NRHP evaluations because they may be slated for demolition at the tunnel portal areas. Ms. Cole noted the properties would have the same level of Section 106 protection if

they were a contributing resource to a historic district—even if they were not individually listed on or eligible for the NRHP. Mr. Almquist clarified the evaluations would be beneficial during the Section 4(f) analysis, under which the relative significance of each Section 4(f) property is a consideration.
    - *Comment: Under Section 4(f) evaluation of impacts to the community, Alternative 11 has a higher impact on the neighborhood.* Answer: That is a strong consideration.
- The group reviewed the 19 historic properties and the 237 contributing resources to historic districts.
- Portal Areas
    - Detailed maps of portal excavation areas for each alternative were provided to the attendees, with identified historic properties highlighted.
    - A discussion followed of the south portal area under Alternative 3A where surface impacts were noted in yellow on the map. Mr. Almquist explained that after cut-and-cover construction in a trench, there would be 'sliver' impacts to properties, including the LBR Warehouse and the American Storage Company.
    - At the boring portal, the surface would be disturbed for cut-and-cover but filled in and reused; the plans showed a cut section with retaining walls and the track below grade, with improvements at grade for the tracks.
    - *Question: Would Bridge 2410 be demolished?* Answer: There would be no direct impacts. Baltimore City plans to replace the bridge.
    - *Question: What are the limits of disturbance?* Answer: The limits of disturbance are shown in yellow on the mapping provided and include temporary retaining walls; there may also be additional temporary impacts.
    - *Question: How many boring machines will be needed?* Answer: The project has not yet decided on the process, but the engineering team anticipates two boring machines. Additional background on the construction process was provided.
- Mr. Almquist continued by noting that on the tables, properties listed with a 'Y' will be demolished. Alternatives 3B and 3C include shifted alignments to improve the existing curve located at West Baltimore MARC.
- *Question: Ms. Schiszik asked are costs to move people being considered?* Answer: Yes, those costs will be included in the EIS.
- American Ice Company
    - *Question: Would the American Ice Company be demolished?* Answer: Yes, for Alternatives 3B, 11A, and 11B.
    - Mr. Hopkins asserted the American Ice Company is the single most important building in the study area, noting its history as the earliest ice manufacturer in the country, its importance to the region for the last 100 years, its significance as a visual landmark, and the focus of development in west Baltimore. While the property has lost support structures that completed the complex, the main building retains integrity to reflect both its architectural character and the property's role in Baltimore's ice industry. The recent NRHP designation of this large, half block property has made it eligible for historic tax credits. While the property has been vacant for a long time and the owner's

intentions are unknown, it has high redevelopment potential. Baltimore Heritage will not support demolition of the American Ice Company.

- *Question: Ms. Cole asked, how does the American Ice Company fit in with MDOT's plans for the West Baltimore MARC Station in terms of transit-oriented development (TOD)?* Answer: The B&P Tunnel project does not preclude TOD at the station but, depending on the alternative chosen, could convert part of the area proposed for redevelopment to transportation use. The loss of the Red Line project could also impact the TOD potential, as the future of the station as a multi-modal transit hub was an important component of the West Baltimore MARC Station Master Plan. Mr. Hopkins pointed out the large size of the American Ice Company property, mostly consisting of surface lot. He noted that reuse of the historic building is possible.

- Alternative 3C addresses the curve at the West Baltimore MARC Station by shifting west to flatten the curve, and has impacts to industrial properties in addition to residential.
  - *Question: This alternative would not demolish the American Ice Company but requires boring in the Western Maryland Railroad area?* Answer: Yes, and impacts the asphalt plant, houses on Edmondson Avenue, the firehouse and the old railroad station property. Mr. Prosser of Amtrak added the portal would be south of the Western Maryland Railroad tracks; the track no longer connects to the Northeast Corridor.
  - *Question: Mr. Howard noted, is it correct to summarize 3A has the most minimal impacts, but does not address the curve; B and C address the curve in two different ways but has more impacts?* Answer: Yes, there would be a travel time difference of plus or minus 30 seconds. Even Alternative 3A is faster than the speed today. Alternative 3A "locks in" the curve at the West Baltimore MARC station for the life of the new tunnel. The curve is also a barrier to creating high-level platforms at the existing West Baltimore MARC station. Mr. Goon added that currently the team has no preferred alternative.
  - *Question: Mr. Hopkins asked, how important is 30 seconds?* Answer: Mr. Prosser explained it would impact allowable speeds and remain a bottleneck in the future, which is detrimental to service for MARC and Amtrak. The project is part of a larger Northeast Corridor effort where small time savings at locations along the corridor will add up.
  - *Question: Is the West Baltimore MARC Station ADA-accessible?* Answer: Currently, the West Baltimore MARC Station does not include high-level platforms considered the ADA standard. The station is currently in compliance with the law, as it was built prior to the ADA regulations but any major change to the station would require high-level platforms.
    - If 3A is chosen, it will not change the West Baltimore MARC platforms.
    - Alternatives 3B, 3C, 11A, and 11B would each modify the track alignment at West Baltimore MARC, flattening the curve and allowing ADA accessibility.
    - 11B would lower the profile and pass underneath Franklin and Mulberry Streets.
    - 11A would shift the West Baltimore MARC platforms south by around 700 feet.

- Alternatives 11A and 11B
    - The alignment in 11A is straighter and has major impacts to historic properties including the American Ice Company. The alternative is not likely to be advanced, but is still under consideration.
        - Mr. Hopkins commented that the demolition could jeopardize properties and districts, including the pending NRHP Midtown Edmondson nomination.
    - Alternative 11B would reduce impacts relative to 11A by shifting the south portal to the American Ice Company block. The West Baltimore MARC station would be below grade. The alternative will include a temporary spur for the Northeast Corridor during construction to maintain Northeast Corridor service.
    - *Question: Ms. De Arcangelis asked, can anything be built on cut-and-cover refill?* Answer: Yes, that could include a building, park, etc. The depth of the refill would have to be considered when determining what could go there. Potential mitigation could include TOD and reinvestment.
    - *Question: Could you tunnel before the American Ice Company?* Answer: Shifting the portal further south would interfere with the Gwynns Falls Bridge. Mr. Prosser further explained the clearance needed in the tunnel and the challenges of fitting in other rail infrastructure such as interlockings and platforms, which cannot be located on vertical grades.
- Vent Shaft Areas
    - Detailed maps of the area of consideration for vent mid-tunnel vent plants for each alternative were provided to the attendees, with identified historic properties and district contributing resources highlighted.

Next Steps

- Ms. Cole emphasized the importance of not rushing the Section 106 process. Consulting parties need to be comfortable with the historic properties identified, and would also need the report before providing comments.
- Mr. Hopkins asked that the discussion at the next meeting focus on the vent shafts.
- *Question: Will these materials be posted to the project website?* Answer: Yes, there will be a Section 106 specific page added to the website with the materials presented today *(Note: The material presented at the meeting were uploaded on the project website on July 27, 2015)*.
- *Question: What is the schedule for the report?* Answer: FRA has to comment on the historic architectural and archeological reports. After the project team addresses the comments, the documents will be distributed to consulting parties for your review and comment. This will take place in about two weeks *(Note: These reports were posted July 31, 2015, on RK&K's DMS site for consulting parties review; hard copies were also distributed to the Maryland Historical Trust on the same day)*.
- Mr. Goon added that follow-up discussion could include the north portal and vent shafts. Mr. Almquist asked if another 2.5 hour meeting could be scheduled within the next three weeks; attendees could expect to be contacted via email to schedule a date and time *(Note: August 5, 2015 from 1:30 to 4:00 has been scheduled for the second consulting parties meeting)*.

- The group asked that the project team develop a timeline for the Section 106 process, which was noted as an action item *(Note: A timeline has been created, and will be presented and discussed at the second consulting parties meeting)*.